



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/508,924	09/24/2004	Makoto Motoyoshi	075834.00325	8150
33448	7590	12/12/2005	EXAMINER	
ROBERT J. DEPK LEWIS T. STEADMAN TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GLANGLORG, BLACKSTONE & MARR 105 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 3600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-6299			NGUYEN, TRAM HOANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2818	
DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/508,924	MOTOYOSHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tram H. Nguyen	2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-38 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.
 - I. Claims 1-19 drawn to a semiconductor device and a method of manufacturing said semiconductor device, classified in class 257, subclass 295.
 - II. Claims 20-38 drawn to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device, classified in class 438, subclass 3.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP, 806.05(f)). In the instant case, unpatentability of the Group I invention would not necessarily imply unpatentability of the Group II invention, because the device of Group I invention could be made by a process materially different from that of the Group II invention. For example, the process of claim 20 can be materially altered by forming a magnetic flux concentrator of high-permeability layer at least on both of the lateral sides of said first wiring.

In the case that Group I, claims 1-19, is elected, this group of claims has following patentably distinct species of the disclosed invention. The various combinations of the species with the subspecies provide an undue burden to the

examiner. The Applicant is required to elect one subspecies and one species, where the combination of a single subspecies and a single species is patentably distinct.

Species A, Fig. 1A-1B, 5, 13, 14, 17, 22, 24, 27A-E

Species B, Fig. 6, 14, 18, 23, 25, 28A-E

Species C, Fig. 10, 15, 19

Species D, Fig. 11, 20

Species E, Fig. 12

In the case that Group II, claims 20-38, is elected, this group of claims has following patentably distinct species of the disclosed invention. The various combinations of the species with the subspecies provide an undue burden to the examiner. The Applicant is required to elect one subspecies and one species, where the combination of a single subspecies and a single species is patentably distinct.

Species A, Fig. 33A-33C, 39, 43

Species B, Fig. 34A-E, 40, 44

Species C, Fig. 31A-31B

Species D, Fig. 30A-30B, 36A-36B, 42

Species E, Fig. 31A-31B, 37A-37B

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 20 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, the fields

of search are not co-extensive and separate examination would be required, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 FR 1.143).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tram H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-5526. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am - 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax numbers for all Customer Service is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-1625.


David Nelms
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

THN
Tram H. Nguyen
Art Unit 2818
11/18/2005.